

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned, final Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1, 3-15, 17-26, and 28-34, were rejected. The claims were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Jorma, Bridges, and Whaglan. Additionally, claims 1, 3-15, 17-26, and 28-34 were rejected under Section 112, first paragraph, for lack of support in the specification for the conveying of altered values to a central database, as cited in the independent claims.

Responsive to the rejections of the claims, the independent claims, claims 1, 15, 21, 32, and 34 have been amended, in manners set forth herein, believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combination of references as well as to recite subject matter that conforms with Section 112, first paragraph.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the recitation of the storage element is amended, now to state that the listing formed of the database stored at the storage element is dynamically updateable. And, the recitation of the detector is amended now to state that the detector is further responsively to alter an indication of a network-portion capability of any of the plurality of networks of the listing when the message is of values identifying a network-portion capability to be different than identified in the listing. The others of the independent claims had been analogously amended.

Support for the amended recitations is found in the disclosure, e.g., on page 6, lines 13-15, which states that determinations of network capabilities are dynamically made and on page 7, lines 9-19, which states that values stored at the database are updated with current information

and that if the data contained in the message indicates a network capability that differs with that indicated in the database listing, the database listing is modified.

The Applicants assert that none of the cited references disclose the amended subject matter and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under Section 103(a). Specifically, the Applicants assert that Bridges, relied upon by the Examiner for disclosing updating of a database, fails to disclose dynamic updating in which an indication of a network-portion capability is altered if a message is of values identifying a network-portion capability to be different than that identified in the listing of a database.

The Applicants acknowledge that paragraph [0085] of Bridges makes reference to subsequent updates or reprogramming of specific data in a PSL/IRDB, which may be performed over-the-air. The Applicants assert, however, that this is not the equivalent of the amended recitation of altering the indication of a network-portion capability if a message identifies a network-portion capability to differ with a capability stored in the listing. That is to say, the recited invention pertains to alteration of the network-portion capability while, in contrast, Bridges, as indicated in paragraph [0046] of Bridges, is limited to storing indications of bands associated with a preferred system.

The other cited references similarly fail to disclose this amended feature. Accordingly, the Applicants assert that no combination of these references can be formed to create the invention, as now-recited in the independent claims.

Because the remaining dependent claims include all the recitations of their respective parent claims, the Applicants further assert that these claims are also patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references.

With respect to the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection of the claims, recitations related to the conveyance of altered values to a central database have been cancelled from the claims. Additionally, recitations pertaining to initial provisioning of a database with an abridged copy of values stored in a central database have also been cancelled. The claims are therefore believed to be in conformity with Section 112, first paragraph.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, the independent claims, and the remaining dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is, respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L. P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692